

The finding of allowable subject matter in the Applicant's foregoing claims 12 and 22 as well as addressing the merits of original claims 17, 19, 20 and 21 necessarily required the consideration of Applicant's disclosure and search of prior art disclosing or suggesting perimeter walls in triangular facades forming a building structure.

A further basis for reconsideration is the interoperation applied to the Nelson patent 3,346,998 of teaching "an array of first (10 in Figure 8), second (10A in Figure 8), and third (10 in Figure 8) triangular façade elements...." An examination of figure 8 of the Nelson reference reveals an application of reference sign 10 to 10 discrete components and an application of reference sign 10A to 14 discrete components which does not include all hidden components. It can be assumed that Applicant's response compelled an explanation of the interpretation of Nelson as evidenced by the "Attachment A" comprised of sheet 1 of the drawings of the Nelson patent to the Final rejection. The applied indicia by the Examiner developed for the first time presented a significant issue to which the Applicant should, it is submitted, be entitled even under "compact prosecution" to respond. For these reasons, it is believed Applicant's response to the Final rejection should be entered and considered on the merits. And when considered, the record will place the application in condition for allowance. The MPEP in the matter of responses to a final rejection will allow for the requested consideration.

Accordingly, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. In the event the Examiner believes a telephone interview will further the prosecution he is invited to telephone the undersigned at 412-366-6200.

Respectfully submitted,



Clifford A. Poff
Registration No. 24,764
Agent for Applicant

CAPoff/lcl